



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

JOURNAL

OF

FARM ECONOMICS

VOL. IV.

APRIL, 1922.

NO. 2

THE CITYWARD MOVEMENT.

JOHN G. THOMPSON,

WASHINGTON, D. C.

The march to the city, a movement that has been clearly in evidence for at least a century in this country, still continues unabated. The lines may be laggard here or may even fall back a little there, but the movement as a whole goes resistlessly forward. The Census of 1920 reveals the fact that more than one half of our population now lives in the urban centers—that is, in cities and towns of 2,500 population or more. The urban population, as thus defined, which in 1910 comprised 45.8 per cent of the total population of the country, by 1920 had increased to 51.4 per cent of the total. And if those persons who live in incorporated places of less than 2,500 population be added to the strictly urban population, what may be called “the agglomerated” population of the country comprised 59.9 per cent of the total in 1920. We have no means of knowing just what proportion of our population lived in places of 2,500 and over at the beginning of the national period. But in 1790 only 3.3 per cent of the total population of the country lived in places of 8,000 or over; and by 1820 this proportion had increased to but 4.9 per cent. In 1920, however, 43.8 per cent, or well toward one half the total population of the country, lived in places of this size or above. Moreover, during the decade 1910–1920 the urban population as a whole, as at first defined, increased to the extent of 25.7 per cent, while the rural population increased but 5.4 per cent—the rate per cent increase of the urban population thus having been nearly five times that of the rural population in the last census decade.

While this cityward movement is general for the country as a

whole, it has proceeded to very different lengths in the different geographical sections and divisions. New England, with 79.2 per cent of her population urban, has approximately four out of five persons living in the urban centers—a proportion almost exactly identical with that for England and Wales as a whole. Rhode Island, with 97.5 per cent of her population living in cities and towns of 2,500 or more, ranks first among the States in degree of urbanization, though Massachusetts, with 94.8 per cent urban, is a close second. At the other extreme stands the East South Central States, with but 22.4 per cent of their population living in places of 2,500 or more in 1920. Mississippi, with but 13.4 per cent of her population urban, is the most purely rural of our States, though North Dakota, with 13.6 per cent urban, is a close second. Then follow South Dakota, Arkansas, South Carolina, New Mexico, North Carolina, and Nevada, in order,—all with less than 20 per cent of their population urban.

Moreover, the cityward trend is no less in evidence in many other parts of the world than it is in our own country. Indeed, in some parts of Europe, as in Great Britain and in Germany, that movement has proceeded farther than it has in this country. In England and Wales, in 1911, 78.1 per cent of the population lived in the urban districts; and by 1921 this proportion had increased to 79.3 per cent. Scotland is almost as highly urbanized as England and Wales. Sixty per cent of the total population of the German Empire lived in the urban centers in 1910 (in Saxony the urban population comprised 73 per cent of the total population in 1910). By 1911 the urban population of France had increased to 43.7 per cent of the total population; and since 1846 there had been an absolute decrease in the rural population of that country amounting to over 4,400,000 persons. Austria, in 1910, had about the same proportion of the population urban as France, largely concentrated in the city of Vienna. Belgium is even more highly industrialized and urbanized than France and Austria. And in Italy the ten largest cities increased in population at the rate of 77 per cent during the period 1871–1911, while the increase for that country as a whole, including these cities, amounted to but 29 per cent for the same period. The city population of the Netherlands also grows faster than the rural population, though there is a good annual increase in the latter. In Denmark there was a decided movement toward the city from about the middle of the last century until the beginning of the present century. But in recent years the excess in the urban over the rural increase has been small. (In 1911 the urban population in Denmark amounted to about 40 per

cent of the total population.) In Norway developments have been very similar to those in Denmark, while Sweden and Switzerland have also reflected, in a measure, the cityward trend—as have even the Balkan countries and Russia in minor degree.¹

The cityward trend in Australia has also been very marked and takes the direction, particularly, of disproportionate concentration in the provincial capitals. The six State capitals of Australia are estimated to share between them 42 per cent of the total population of the Commonwealth, and three fifths of the total increase of population during the last ten years occurred in these capital cities. Sydney and Melbourne now contain nearly one half of the total population of New South Wales and of Victoria, respectively. And even in New Zealand the preliminary returns of the recent census show that the four chief towns increased in population to a greater extent than all the rest of the country—rural areas, secondary and small towns—combined.² In Argentina the great city of Buenos Aires occupies a situation quite similar to that held by the capital cities of the Australian provinces (Buenos Aires, however, contains not quite 25 per cent of the population of Argentina). Since 1891 a pronounced movement toward the city has also been in evidence in many parts of Canada, with serious loss in numbers in the rural population in a number of the older eastern provinces and with disproportionately rapid gain in the population of the urban centers even in the western provinces. During the decade 1901–1911 the urban population, officially distinguished as that living in cities, towns, and incorporated villages, increased to the extent of 62.25 per cent, while the rural population, or that living in unincorporated villages and in the open country, increased but 17.16 per cent. During the same period the cities of Winnipeg and Vancouver absorbed about one half, and Montreal and Toronto more than one half, of the total gain in population for their respective provinces.³

In Asia, Japan is rapidly developing her manufacturing and commercial interests with the normal results so far as the concentration of population is concerned; and China and India, which have long contained a certain number of important cities, though still predominantly rural and agricultural, have entered upon the stage of industrial development and, doubtless, upon the era of rapid city growth.

¹ Poland, now no longer a part of Russia, formerly constituted the most highly urbanized part of Russia.

² *Literary Digest*, Sept. 3, 1921, citing the *Wellington Dominion*.

³ The proportion of the urban to the total population in Canada increased from 37.64 per cent, in 1901, to 45.54 per cent, in 1911.

CAUSES OF THE CITYWARD MOVEMENT.

The causes of the cityward movement are, in detail, many and varied and have operated with varying intensity in the various countries, in the different sections of the same country, and also with respect to the various types of individuals who have felt and yielded to the call of the city. Certain commonly asserted important causes of the cityward movement, which either are not at all so operative or even operate in reality in the opposite direction, or else are operative only in a local way and in a degree much more restricted than is commonly recognized, may first be noted. Thus the view that there is necessarily "a swarming" of the excess part of the agricultural population and a settling of this excess in the cities because the operation of the law of diminishing returns in agriculture makes it impossible for that occupation to retain and profitably employ the increased numbers that result from the natural growth of population in the rural districts must be wholly rejected as a real and general cause of the cityward movement. For, in the main, agriculture is occupied in the production of the necessities of life—particularly foodstuffs—and people can be employed in the other occupations only so far as they can be set free from the production of these necessities of agricultural production. But it is clear that the operation of the law of diminishing returns in agriculture must work to diminish the productiveness of human labor and thus to require the retention of a larger proportion of the population in agriculture than would otherwise be required. This asserted cause of the cityward movement thus really operates in the opposite direction. But its influence does work to extend agricultural production from the older into the newer agricultural areas and may thus materially affect the distribution of the agricultural population of the world, as between the different countries and as between the different sections of the same country. For the same reason soil exhaustion must be rejected as a general cause of the cityward movement, though it has often operated to cause a decline in the agricultural population in many separate parts of the world. But for the world as a whole, the greater the degree to which soil exhaustion extends, the larger the proportion of the productive labor of the world that must be employed in agriculture to produce food and other necessities of agricultural production. Soil exhaustion thus really tends, in general, to restrict the cityward movement.

Again, the view that the cityward movement is due, in an important way, to a pushing in of the excess population resulting from a relatively high birth rate and a relatively low death rate, in the rural

districts, to make up for an asserted deficit of population in the cities, resulting from an alleged excess of deaths over births there, must be largely rejected today. At an earlier period, when there was an excessive mortality in many cities, this cause did operate to sustain the actual annual movement of population from country to city and *to prevent a loss of population* in certain cities. But it did not formerly, much less does it today, explain *the positive rapid increase* in the population of a great number of cities. And, especially, it does not explain *the vastly increased proportion of the total population* living in urban centers in general today. Moreover, largely as a result of the practical elimination of the excess of urban over rural mortality in recent years, the excess of births is greater in proportion to the population in the urban districts in this country, and in some of the other countries, than in the rural districts.

Lastly, far too much emphasis has been placed upon the assertion that the farm youth have been educated away from the farm into city life. This is not to deny that the education of the youth in the agricultural districts has been seriously defective, in many cases absolutely unsuited, as a preparation for farm life. But these very defects have largely represented the semi-conscious effort of society to adjust itself to the great fact of the cityward movement itself, already under way as a result of other causes. It certainly would have been no less a mistake to educate a large proportion of the rural youth for farm life than could, under the changing conditions, have been employed there than it was to fail to educate properly for farm life those destined to remain on the farm. Indeed, had rural education been more effective it must have operated actually to promote the cityward trend—a fact to the consideration of which we shall return in another connection.

The most general cause of the cityward movement is to be found in the advantages afforded, through the aggregation of population in a common center, for human coöperation for certain purposes and objects. These advantages, which relate in part to political, in part to social, and in part to economic activities, have always been present, in a measure, and the origin and growth of centers of population from the beginning are doubtless to be traced, in a general way, to this cause. But certain developments in more recent times have operated so as vastly to increase the importance of these advantages for the purpose of what we are today accustomed to regard as the more strictly urban activities, while minimizing these advantages or even eliminating them altogether for the more strictly agricultural operations to which they also pertained, in no small measure, in earlier

times. To trace the developments associated with these changes, even in the barest outline, would be entirely impossible in such a paper as this. We must therefore be content to point out some of the principal factors involved in this movement.

The coming of the new order of things was closely associated with the development of geographical and occupational division of labor. The earliest factor making for the growth of large centers of population, as distinguished from mere villages and towns, and one which is still very important relative to the same end, was trade. Now trade, even of a primitive kind, assumes a certain development of human division of labor, particularly of a geographical or territorial character. But the adaptability of production along certain lines to the application of mechanical power, on an increasingly large scale and in an ever more highly concentrated degree, to which a dispersive occupation like modern agriculture was not, and is not adapted, afforded a basis for a progressive disassociation of these former lines from the strictly agricultural operations, with which they had long been combined, in the main, and contributed to concentrate them in certain places where still other advantages, such as favorable location with reference to raw materials and markets, could be realized. The perfecting of efficient modern methods of transportation and of communication by water, by land, and finally by air, was, of course, an indispensable factor in these developments—as also in affording adequate supplies of food for a population that is not self-sustaining in this respect. Moreover, these agencies of transportation and of communication are themselves well served by the advantages that concentration and agglomeration afford, and thus become, in turn, important city-building factors in a direct and immediate sense through the centering of their activities, in large measure, in the urban centers. These developments gradually removed from the sphere of the agriculturist the functions of manufacture and of transportation and transferred them for performance to the growing centers of population. On the other hand, a part of the farm population had been gradually released for employment elsewhere through this progressive narrowing of farm activities to the more strictly agricultural operations and through the introduction and growing use of labor-saving machinery, of urban make, in agriculture. And as the distribution of population is primarily determined by the distribution of employment or of occupation, we find in this series of developments the earliest and most evident of the causes of the modern trend of population from country to city.

But this transfer, from farm to city, of certain employments formerly associated with farm work did not end its influence upon the cityward trend with the corresponding transfer, to the cities, of a part of the farm population proportional to the amount of labor previously bestowed upon those activities on the farm. If this had been all, the cityward movement must have come to a substantial halt years ago. But this transfer resulted in the separation from farm work of those employments which, due to the nature of the demand for their products, are capable of almost indefinite expansion—given due variety and essential cheapness in production and adequate purchasing power on the part of consumers. On the other hand, employment on the farm was more and more reduced to the production of the absolute necessities of life, especially food supplies, for which there is an almost inexorable demand irrespective of cost up to a certain point, but beyond which point there is practically no additional *total* demand by a given population, however fine the quality, varied the character, low the price of these necessities, or however adequate the purchasing power of consumers.⁴ As a result of this circumstance the use of "labor-saving" machinery in the city industries is really "product-increasing" and not "labor-saving," while its use on the farm is really "labor-saving." Every further improvement in the efficiency of human labor in modern agriculture, therefore, be it due to the use of more and better labor-saving machinery, to higher intelligence on the part of farm operators and producers, to a better technique or an improved business organization and management, to the elimination of animal diseases and insect pests, or to what-not, must, under present conditions, inexorably tend, *for the world as a whole*, in the direction of a *proportional* reduction of numbers in agriculture and a corresponding *proportional* increase in the number

⁴ This statement, while substantially accurate in the main, needs some qualification. It is evident, of course, that though the total demand for food products in general, in the world as a whole, is affected in small degree by a change in price, the market demand in a given country—especially for a given food product—may be greatly affected by such change through the agency of the export trade. Change of price also affects the extent to which one food product is used rather than another. Moreover, agriculture is also engaged in the production of the raw materials for clothing—particularly cotton and wool; and for clothing there is not the same rigidity of demands as for food products. Lastly, the total demand for food is itself not absolutely rigid, as it is affected in some degree by waste and by underconsumption and overconsumption. Those who are interested in a further discussion of this phase of the subject are referred to an article, by the writer of this paper, in *The Journal of Political Economy*, for February, 1916, under the title of "The Nature of the Demand for Agricultural Products."

of those employed in the expansive city industries.⁵ On the other hand, the further development of the use of so-called labor-saving devices in the city industries and occupations, already developed to a degree far beyond that which obtains in agriculture, is for the reasons stated not inconsistent with a further proportional increase in the urban population.

In the causes that have thus led to the transfer of the expansive industries and employments from the farm to the city and to the retention on the farm of those employments for which there is comparatively a rigidly limited demand, we find the main impetus back of the cityward movement. And the so-called defects of rural education have, in large measure, grown out of a half-conscious attempt on the part of the rural community and of the State to work out an adjustment with reference to this movement. The latter has not been, in material degree, the result of defective rural education. Indeed, an education that would have made the farm population more efficient producers must, so far, have promoted the rural exodus, as its influence would have been quite analogous to that of a labor-saving device.

Many other causes, usually less general and less ultimate in character than those to which attention has just been called, have contributed to further the cityward movement. For one thing, more people are required on the farm when land is first reclaimed from the forest and brought into cultivation and when farm structures and other necessary farm improvements must be created than are required later when all these improvements have been effected. Again, in our own country, occupation and settlement began with the areas that were less fertile and less easily cultivable and extended later to those areas that were more fertile and that were much better adapted to the introduction and use of labor-saving machinery. This circumstance, of course, contributed to diminish the proportion of the population required to provide subsistence for the population as a whole. The comparatively long hours of labor and relatively arduous character of the work, generally speaking, on the farm, especially for women in the farm home, and the relatively smaller remuneration for the same grade of capacity and for the same degree of effort, have each exer-

⁵ Increase in the total population of the world, requiring an increase in the production of food, may check the tendency toward an *absolute decline* in the number of those employed in agriculture—or, especially if the law of diminishing returns should operate sharply, even require an increase in the total number employed on the farm. But under the conditions stated, the trend toward a further *proportional* decline in the number of those employed on the farm is inevitable.

cised an important immediate influence. But the first and last of these influences can be traced, in considerable degree, to the inferior opportunity that the rural community affords for effective coöperation and organization on the part of the farm population. Moreover, the influence of other and more ultimate causes has frequently manifested itself superficially in the form of relatively low returns in agriculture—as when the rapid introduction of labor-saving machinery, or the rapid opening up of new and fertile areas for cultivation, or a combination of both circumstances, or the sudden failure of the foreign market, as within the past year, has contributed to a condition of over-production and excessive decline in price. Excessive decline in the price of agricultural products also almost always reflects the peculiar nature of the demand for these products, as a result of which a comparatively small surplus, or deficit, has a disproportionately large influence upon the price.

Then political causes have exerted an influence. The Peloponnesian War in Greece drove the rural population into the cities, where they afterwards were inclined to remain. Rome, in her palmy days, contained a vast number of functionaries, and the tributes of grain that were received from subject countries and distributed freely to the populace attracted a numerous rabble. The insecurity of the feudal period rendered the manorial village and the walled town practically universal. The wars in which this country has been engaged have usually given an impetus to industrial development and thus to city life. The recent World War certainly stimulated city growth in France, and very probably in this country also.⁶ And before the recent war the military training which reservists in Germany and in France received is said to have been an inciting cause of the rural exodus, because it brought the youth of those countries into contact with city life. In this country the government land policy and government aid to internal improvements hastened the opening up of the fertile areas of the West, stimulated trade and manufactures in the cities, rendered agriculture unprofitable in the older agricultural regions, and thus gave a special impetus to the cityward trend in the East. Again, while the wealth of natural resources basic to industry and the encouragement afforded by a numerous and opulent population would, in any case, have ultimately led to a large industrial and urban development in this country, it is clear that our protective tariff policy, through the subsidy offered to manufactures, has hastened this development and has thus afforded a considerable impetus to the city-

⁶ An opposite influence was probably exerted—at least temporarily—in England.

ward movement. Nominally, agriculture has been supposed to share in the protection afforded by the tariff. But in point of fact the agricultural class as a whole has never been able, for various reasons, to realize the advantages which the tariff has been supposed to afford to agriculture—a fact never more strikingly demonstrated than by the lamentable failure of the present “emergency tariff” to bring relief to that occupation. On the other hand, as consumers, agriculturists have been penalized by the protection extended to manufactures.

Then there are the conveniences and advantages that location in the centers of population affords to a great number of miscellaneous activities and enterprises—educational, scientific, journalistic, religious, propagandist, and promotional in general. Agricultural colleges are usually located at or near some center of population. An agricultural journal of importance could scarcely be published from a small village or from the open country. Even back-to-the-land or forward-to-the-land movements usually function from some urban center! And it is of interest that this body holds the sessions of its annual meeting in this great industrial center, with its nearly three-score of surrounding satellite cities and towns, and that we are here today considering this question.

Lastly, we have to recognize the fact of human gregariousness—that man is a social animal. And in this connection the greatly superior opportunity that the urban environment affords for social contact, in its various aspects, counts heavily against the isolation of the countryside.

RESULTS.

To the writer of this paper the results of the cityward movement appear, on the whole, to have been beneficial—both to the community at large and the State, and to the agricultural class itself. In spite of the fear, so frequently expressed over many years in the past, that the movement threatens impending famine, there is every reason to believe that the people of the world were, in general, never so well fed and clothed as they were at the beginning of the recent World War. And if there are tens of millions of starving people in the world at this time, that circumstance can scarcely be charged to the cityward movement. For these starving millions are to be found, not in the highly urbanized countries, but in those great areas where the urbanizing movement has made little headway as yet, where the normal condition is that of a great surplus of agricultural products for export, and where economic, social, and political conditions are still profoundly disturbed by the titanic upheaval caused by the war.

Today, after a cityward movement of more than one hundred years that has made this nation of over 105,000,000 people more than one half urban, corn is once again the fuel in many of the farm homes of the Corn Belt; and our farmers are experiencing the greatest financial distress as a result of their inability to dispose of, at even greatly reduced prices, their surpluses of the other great farm products. Want and distress, to repeat, are widely prevalent today—even, in some measure, in this fortunate country of ours. To a certain extent, therefore, the situation in which the farmer finds himself today is due to a condition of underconsumption rather than to a condition of overproduction. Moreover, as already indicated, in arguing from an observed reduction in the price of agricultural products we are very likely to overestimate the extent of the surplus which has caused the price reduction, in view of the fact that surpluses and deficits in the case of the necessities of life exert a disproportionately great influence upon price. Yet, when all possible allowance is made, it can scarcely be maintained that we are suffering today from underproduction in agriculture.

On the other hand, the development of great consuming populations in the urban centers has brought to the farmer, under normal conditions, profitable markets, relief from a chronic condition of excessive competition and overproduction, and encouragement to improved methods of production. And the agricultural class has shared not fully nor fairly, perhaps, but yet in considerable degree, in the general increase in well-being. The country is still exploited, in the economic sphere, by the city, but exercises, in turn, the rather futile privilege of interfering in the political affairs of the urban centers. Unfortunately, the profoundly disturbing and disorganizing effects of the cityward movement upon the social life and institutions of the rural community have been as yet only partially remedied. And it is in this sphere that the really hurtful effects of the trend to the city upon rural life are manifest.

Again, there has been an extraordinary decline in the death rate coincident with the cityward movement; and it is not too much to say that the modern health movement has been overwhelmingly an urban movement. Moreover, no one who traces the course of political and constitutional development and makes a careful survey of political conditions today in the highly urbanized and in the overwhelmingly rural countries can indorse the view that the cityward movement has had an unfavorable effect in the political sphere. Lastly, although the millennium is evidently by no means yet at hand, there is substan-

tial evidence to show that there has been a gradual rise in ethical, moral, and religious standards.

REMEDIES.

What of remedies? Many persons urgently assert the need of taking measures to turn back the tide that is running so strongly toward the city. But it is a question whether anything can be done substantially to control such a movement. The student of the operation of the social and economic forces comes to have a very wholesome respect for their tremendously potent, persistent, and far-reaching character. He observes, with much interest, that very many of those who inveigh against this movement themselves respond to the compelling influence of its underlying forces. "Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further" is almost as far beyond the sphere of finite control for the tides of this movement as it is for the tides of the ocean. For twenty centuries it has mocked the recurring attempts to fix its limits. Moreover, the absence of predicted catastrophe, over so long a period, tends strongly to bear out the conclusion already reached that the movement has been, on the whole, beneficial. Both the futility and the disutility of the proposal to reverse this movement are revealed when it is reduced to its real meaning—that agriculture should discard its improved and labor-saving implements and processes and should revert toward the stage of the hand sickle and the winnowing sheet; that the factory should be abolished and the spinning wheel and the hand loom restored to the farm home and the village shop; that the farmer should once more become "a jack of all trades," should wagon his small surplus of grain 50 to 100 miles to an uncertain market and almost as laboriously bring back with him the few and narrowly assorted articles that he did not produce for himself, should conduct his droves of sheep or of hogs or of cattle a month's journey to distant slaughtering grounds with a limited outlet; in short, that the whole course of industrial evolution should be turned back, or at least halted.

No one, of course, is urging such extreme measures. Of course not—when it is seen what the proposal involves. But a check to the cityward movement certainly involves the cessation of the further operation of the causes that have led toward the city; and a substantial return to the land would necessarily involve a substantial movement in the direction of the more primitive conditions to which attention has just been called.

On the whole the control of the movement must be left to the

reacting influence of the same class of forces that have caused it: underproduction in agriculture, definite and persistent rise in the price of farm products as compared with the price of city products, an equal or superior degree of prosperity and equal or superior conditions of life in general on the farm; in the city industries and occupations, overproduction, falling prices and incomes, industrial depression and increased cost of living, and less tolerable conditions of life in general in the cities. These corrective forces may be trusted to work surely. But they may work somewhat ruthlessly; and in spite of the resources that modern society can bring to its own relief, an adjustment made by these forces alone is likely to involve a certain amount of shock. No man is wise enough to say when the movement has gone far enough or whether it has gone too far. How far it should go in a given country depends in large degree upon the extent to which a country is to be self-sufficing in respect to food supplies. But this is a factor that is of less significance for the world as a whole. If England and Belgium, for example, were to become more rural through becoming self-sufficing in respect to food supplies, then Argentina and Canada, and perhaps the United States, who export agricultural products to the former countries, must become less rural—that is, presumably more urban. But whatever be the proper limit of the movement, mere momentum may carry it too far for the adjustment to be made with comfort by the natural corrective factors.⁷

The proper sphere of human intervention, then, in respect to the cityward movement would appear to be the taking of such measures, in advance, as would seem designed to ease or relieve the shock of adjustment, if and when it comes. Every proper measure for making and keeping country life prosperous, satisfying, and attractive would have this effect incidentally, while being of the utmost importance in its main and most important effect. Shorter hours of labor are much to be desired on the farm. And, other things remaining equal, such an outcome might also require a larger proportion of the population on the farm. The development of the coöperative movement in agriculture, when directed toward legitimate objects and utilized in a defensive way, may be exceedingly helpful, as Denmark has notably shown, in realizing the advantages that have just been mentioned.

⁷ It is significant, as illustrating, in some degree, the operation of these natural regulative forces, that in England and Wales, where the urbanizing movement has gone farthest, the relative increase in the urban, and in the rural population, which was 15.2 per cent and 2.9 per cent, respectively, for the decade 1891-1901, was 11.1 per cent and 10.2 per cent, respectively, for 1901-11, and 5.2 per cent and 4.3 per cent, respectively, for 1911-21.

Used in a selfish or harmful way, it might react to the great injury of agriculture.

On the other hand, every effort that will be helpful toward the retaining and promoting, on the part of the urban population, of a contact with and a knowledge of the activities of rural life is to be commended. To this end the writer of this paper believes that the teaching of agriculture in the city and town schools, the promotion of school and community garden work, the encouragement of fruit growing, and even of the keeping of chickens, in towns and cities, are of the utmost importance. These activities may be made educative in the best sense of the word, in a general way; they tend toward the retention of areas of open space in the urban centers—a highly desirable feature in itself; they may be made to contribute appreciably to the subsistence of the family in town; and they may render the transition back to rural life less difficult if the time should come when, as a result of a real and undoubted overdevelopment of city life, a return to the land should be required.

Lastly, we should discontinue a tariff policy which, whatever be the intention, still favors the city industries at the expense of agriculture. At best a tariff that would protect everybody would protect nobody. A man who tugs with equal force at the straps of both boots will not succeed in elevating one foot above the other—much less in elevating himself above the floor. But if the tariff boost exerts a stronger upward pull upon the manufacturing boot than upon the agricultural boot, it is clear that the latter will be depressed relative to the former. If we really wish to elevate the agricultural boot, we should, at the least, let go of the straps of the manufacturing boot altogether. But the possibility of carrying out a policy of protection for agricultural products only, in a country with a popular government and with a population more than one half urban, is extremely problematical. Moreover, the absurdity of attempting to “protect” the great agricultural export lines in this country, such as the growing of cotton, of the cereals, and of tobacco, is, or ought to be, clearly manifest. And to divert land, labor, and capital from these and allied lines to the naturally less well-adapted and naturally less profitable uses of wool growing and the growing of sugar-cane and sugar-beets would not materially increase the population upon the soil, while it would seriously reduce the productivity of the factors of production in agriculture. Also, it should be noted that Denmark and Holland, which of all the countries have best solved the problem of maintaining rural development on a parity with urban development, have long been on practically a free-trade basis.

DISCUSSION.

Professor Carver expressed general agreement with the views presented in the paper, but voiced the opinion that the results of the cityward movement have not been favorable in the political sphere. He said that real democracy is possible only among a self-employing population, and that the writer of the paper was probably basing his conclusion that the political results had not been unfavorable upon conditions in the mediæval period, when the rural population was not self-employing while the town population was self-employing, and that the conditions have now in a measure been reversed.

Another speaker asked whether or not the movement to the city was caused by lack of employment.

The writer of the paper replied that he did not think that lack of employment, in the sense in which the speaker appeared to use the term, in the country was a cause of the movement to the city. Continuing, he said: "There have been certain causes that have appeared to promote the cityward movement in certain cases, but these causes have been wholly absent in other cases, where the movement has been just as pronounced. Therefore, such seeming causes have not been real and general causes.

"I can not agree with Professor Carver's view. I do not wish to base my conclusions as to this point upon conditions in mediæval times. We can compare conditions today in countries like England, France, and the United States with those existing in Mexico, and in certain of the Central American and South American countries. Not a few persons in this country whose opinions are entitled to respect believe that England, where the cityward movement has gone farthest, has a more democratic government than we have in the United States. Further, there is no class that has so little political independence as the really dependent class in the rural community. Their every act is known to those upon whom they are dependent for employment. They can not readily organize for their own protection and independence as the city workers can and do. Lastly, they are dependent upon a single person, or upon a very few persons, for employment, while the workers in the cities have a larger opportunity to shift employment to other employers, and are thus more able to be independent in this respect."